REMARKS

In accordance with the Examiner's request, the specification has been reviewed and minor typographical/grammatical errors have been corrected.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define Applicant's invention. It is believed that the amendment to claim 1 is merely clarifying in nature and merely makes explicit what was implicit claim 1 prior to the amendment and, accordingly, the amendment does not constitute a narrowing of the claim.

Claim 9 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

Reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Katayama, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,036). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to an image reproduction apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, display-image discrimination means for discriminating a display mode in which selected image data is to be displayed, the display mode including at least a normal display mode, an at-a-glance display mode and a panoramic display mode; display-mode setting means for setting the display mode, which is discriminated by the display-image discrimination means, to the image data; and display means for displaying the image data in the display mode set by the display-mode setting means.

No such image reproduction apparatus is disclosed by Katayama, et al. More specifically, Katayama, et al. does not disclose the capabilities of providing an electronic album and, accordingly, does not disclose, suggest or provide any means for discriminating, setting or displaying an at-a-glance display mode.

In the rejection of claim 2, the Examiner states that Katayama, et al. does have an at-a-glance mode and cites the abstract and Figs. 8, 11 and 13 to support this point. However, the abstract merely talks in generalities about modes without specifically identifying any mode. Figs. 8(a) and 8(b) are schematic representations of an output image provided through modified aspect ratio video signal generation means and is not an at-a-glance mode. Figs. 11(a) and Figs. 11(b) merely disclose panoramic images and Fig. 13 merely illustrate the types of displays available for the same image. Neither the composite of images, nor any of the images constitutes an at-a-glance display.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is clearly not anticipated by Katayama, et al.

Claims 2-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Katayama, et al. in view of Morag (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,545). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 2

Claim 2 is dependent from claim 1 and is, therefore, patentable over Katayama, et al. for the same reasons.

Further, as discussed above in connection with claim 1, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Katayama, et al. of an at-a-glance mode. Accordingly, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Katayama, et al. of setting a location and size of each image data to be displayed and laying out all images within a designated display area when the display image discrimination means discriminates that the image data is to be displayed at-a-glance.

The Examiner recognizes that Katayama, et al. does not explicitly disclose these features and, accordingly, cites Morag. However, there is no suggestion in Morag or in Katayama, et al. for incorporating an at-a-glance mode, i.e., an album feature, in Katayama, et al. The Examiner contends that the motivation would have been to provide a user friendly personalized album for recognizing the image data with an effective way. However, as discussed above, Katayama, et al.

does not provide an album or an at-a-glance display and, accordingly, there would be no motivation for modifying an album display which doesn't exist in Katayama, et al.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is patentable over the combination of Katayama, et al. and Morag.

Claim 3

Claim 3 is dependent from claim 1 and is, therefore, patentable over Katayama, et al. for the same reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1.

In addition, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Katayama, et al. that a panoramic image is discriminated by comparing the aspect ratio to that of the display area of the display device. Instead, in Katayama, et al., an image is designated as a panoramic image by the recording and reproducing apparatus 100. There is no indication that this is done by comparing the aspect ratio to that of the display area of the display device. In Katayama, et al., only after the apparatus discriminates a panoramic image, based on a designation by the recording and reproducing apparatus 100, are display features selected. See, in this connection, Figs. 8(a) and 8(b) and the discussion in column 6, lines 41-49, as well as the discussion in column 8, lines 1-14.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted, therefore, that claim 3 is clearly patentable over the combination of Katayama, et al. and Morag.

Claims 4-7 and 9

Claims 4-7 and 9 dependent either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for the same reasons, as well as because of the combination of the features set forth in these claims with the features set forth in the claim(s) from which they depend.

Further, Applicant's claims 4-7 and 9 are directed to the scrolling aspect of Applicant's invention. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, there is no scroll operation either disclosed or suggested in Katayama, et al. Indeed, just the opposite is the case in Katayama, et al. When the panoramic image is greater than the available display area, Katayama, et al., rather than providing scrolling, reduces the size of the image (column 8, lines 1-14). Since Katayama, et al. does not have a scroll operation, Katayama, et al. also does not disclose a frame-advance button, as set forth in claims 5 and 6, nor does Katayama, et al. provide, as set forth in claim 7, means for switching between a reduced image display mode in which the panoramic image is reduced in a scroll display mode or, as set forth in claim 10, performing a superimposed display to show which portion of a panoramic image is currently displayed when the panoramic image is scrolled in normal size.

The Examiner does not cite Morag as having any teaching in connection with scrolling and it is clear that Morag has no such teaching.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4-7 and 9 are clearly patentable over Katayama, et al. and Morag.

Claim 8

Claim 8 is dependent from claim 1 and is, therefore, patentable over Katayama, et al. for the same reasons advanced above in connection with claim 1. Further, contrary to what the Examiner contends, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Katayama, et al. of displaying whether an image displayed in a display area is part or whole of the image data. Nor is there any disclosure or suggestion in Morag of this feature, nor does the Examiner contend that there is.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is clearly patentable over Katayama, et al. and Morag.

Claim 10

Claim 10 is dependent from claim 1 and is, therefore, patentable over Katayama, et al. for the same reasons advanced above in connection with claim 1. In addition, claim 10 provides for a divided image stepping display mode in which a panoramic image is divided into a plurality of areas and the areas are advanced frame by frame and displayed step by step when an aspect ratio of the panoramic image is plural times larger than that of a display area. There is no means disclosed or suggested in Katayama, et al. for dividing a panoramic image into a plurality of areas and stepping through the areas frame by frame. Instead, in Katayama, et al., when the aspect ratio of an image is greater than the display area, the image is shrunk to fit the display area. Nor is there any such means, nor does the Examiner contend that there is in Morag.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is clearly patentable over Katayama, et al. and Morag.

Claim 11

Claim 11 is dependent from claim 1 and is, therefore, patentable over claim 1 for the same reasons. In addition, claim 11 provides for switching between a single image display mode and an overall image display mode. No such switching is either disclosed or suggested in Katayama, et al. or in Morag. In addition, claim 11 provides that the overall image display mode performs an overall image display including a divided image stepping display and a scroll display. As discussed above, neither Katayama, et al. nor Morag discloses or suggests either a divided image stepping display or a scroll display.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is clearly patentable over the combination of Katayama, et al. and Morag.

Conclusion

It is believed clear from the foregoing, that neither Katayama, et al, nor Morag nor the combination thereof, either disclose or render obvious any of claims 1-11. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on July 30, 2002:

Martin Pfeffer
Name of applicant, assignee or Registered Representative

Signature

July 30, 2002
Date of Signature

MP:jy:mcm

Respectfully submitted,

Martin Pfeffer
Registration No.: 20,808
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

APPENDIX B

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE
37 C.F.R. § 1.121(b)(iii) AND (c)(ii)

SPECIFICATION:

Paragraph beginning at page 1, line 19 to line 24:

The foregoing prior art electronic album is thus of no interest to a user because an at-a-glance display of plural images is fixed and [lacks] lacking in diversity. Furthermore, a user cannot manage to display panoramic image data, and it is difficult for him or her to use a special panoramic image effectively.

Paragraph beginning at page 3, line 14 to line 17:

FIG. 2B is a view showing an example of a layout of a plurality of images displayed at sight by the image display control section of the electronic album according to the embodiment of the present invention;

Paragraph beginning at page 7, line 9 to line 19:

FIGS. 2A and 2C illustrate the image display control section 42 of the electronic album of the present invention. Referring to FIG. 2A, the section 42 includes a display-image discrimination means X for discriminating a display mode in which selected image data [is] should be displayed, a display-mode setting means Y for setting a display mode discriminated by the display-image discrimination means X in the image data, and a display means Z for displaying the image data in the display mode set by the display-mode setting means Y.

Paragraph beginning at page 11, line 14 to line 24:

FIG. 4C shows a [superimpose] superimposed scroll display mode in which when a panoramic image 80 is scrolled and displayed in a normal size, a [superimpose] superimposed display 90 is performed in the display area 70 to indicate which portion of the image 80 is currently displayed therein. In this mode, the [superimpose] superimposed display 90 allows a user to confirm which portion of the panoramic image is currently displayed (e.g., which image is displayed), at first sight. Consequently, the user need not perform any unnecessary operation and the apparatus is improved in operability.

CLAIMS:

1. An image reproduction apparatus comprising:

display-image discrimination means for discriminating a display mode in which selected image data is to be displayed, the display mode including at least a normal display mode, an at-a-glance display mode and a panoramic display mode;

display-mode setting means for setting the display mode, which is discriminated by the display-image discrimination means, to the image data; and

display means for displaying the image data in the display mode set by the display-mode setting means.

9. An image reproduction apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the display means includes means for performing a [superimpose] superimposed display to show which portion of a panoramic image is currently displayed in a display area when the panoramic image is scrolled in a normal size.